Dear Jim, Anson/Bantam/Plagiarism 12/17/75

Unexpectedly I had a call from Dick Bernabei today. He wanted to check some of his suspicions about the Anson book, which he has been commissioned to reciew, with me. His suspicions were exactly what I have been saying and he did not mean suspicions.

There is a pattern of plagiarism. Dick will keep notes for me, more than he will include in the review.

He finds my work being drawn upon regularly without credit.

He finds the work of others used without credit. In each case it is made to appear as Anson's own work, more so because of the copious footnoting.

He finds secondary sources being credited even though these secondary sources credit the original.

In one case he uses Fred Newcomb's work, actually done for me and I have records and the originals to prove it, as his own. The work actual was Newcomb's, at my request.

In the course of looking for the photo inserts after reading a Publishers Weekly review today by accident I noted a reference to me (p.197). I read it and it credits one of my books not included in the bibliography. Remember my letter to Bantam. Well, at this point the footnotes have been renumbered, which is precisely what would be necessary for a last-minute charge. He went back a few footnotes in the same paragraph and added an XX "a" to No. 231 and thus, I think, had a number less obvious for the interested reference to me. I haven't checked this fully but I believe above this he cites the source I cited as his original work. Same graf.

Bernabei spots a pattern of citing the sources cited by those from whom he crib - bed. I find that in this section on Hall on p. 197 where he has extensive footnoting he pretends to be a real Hall expert. However, he makes gross errors about Hall, not fottnoted to sources, like blaming Hall for Garrison's interest in Bradley. False, as I learned with much anguish and little rest.

I do not t ink that those whou could be helpful, like Jerry, will be. However, if others, like Howard, haven't read the book and would mark it up as they go it could be of considerable help in doing something about Bantam, which has been bastardly in all of this. We owe Temkin something!

The rehash of the past, with much garbage thrown in, hurts no government agency. The idle theorizing, if it is no worse, helps them because this serves the same purposes of a black book. Bantam has never published a tough book. It rejected Whitewash over editorial approval considerably more than necessary. (I have it.)

There is nothing in this suggestion not consistent with the work of those to whom he expresses greatest debt, Scott and Harris. The end product is sympathy for the government and others.

Among the dead giveaways is his failure to list any of my books except IV in his bibliography. Yet as Bernabei noted, that is where the Odio story was first used and where it was first put together. He can't have used WWII on this without knowing it because I am sure there are backward references.

I have had no time for reading. I've just started the introduction. But it is even there and I've marked places. I'll do this as I get a chance.

After this from Bernabei, where it does not rest on me, and with Jerry involved, I think it would be good to push him on this. If he is honest he will be informative. If he is not too sick or too ambitious, he should be willing to be helpful. But please give him the chance or put him on the spot, however you see it.

New Times got WWIV from me in February when I proposed ancillary uses to the editor. I have the letter. We conversed thereafter but nothing came of it. Anson spoke to me April 2. I wrote you 4/22 about the apparent use of my material in the issue dated 4/18/75. Obviously they could have used that transcript id from any other source much earlier. And this, too, is Anson.

I think I asked Dave to do this independently. If not and I don't have a carbon to send him, please ask/remind him. I haven't even had time to read his articles.

Best,